

Amendments to the Drawings

In accordance with 37 CFR § 1.121(d), attached hereto are three new drawing sheets presenting added Figures 6A, 6B, 7, and 8. As required by the examiner, the attached Figures 6A, 6B, 7, and 8 illustrate certain features of the invention recited in the claims.

Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of this application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Applicants acknowledge with gratitude the interview conducted with the examiner at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on March 31, 2009. Applicants' representative first explained to the examiner the differences between Boger's device and Applicants' claimed base insert device. The examiner recommended that claim 1 be amended to recite the structural element that positions the application heads "at a smaller distance than the distance (A)." (Applicants' representative notes that the Interview Summary is slightly inaccurate with regard to the discussion of possible claim amendments. Applicants' representative simply indicated that the examiner's recommendation would be communicated to the Applicants.)

A proposed approach for responding to the examiner's objection to the drawings was also discussed. Applicants' representative proposed adding new drawings to depict the certain claimed features in view of the fact that textual support is found in the original disclosure.

Accordingly, in the present Amendment, the written description portion of the specification, claims 1, 13, 14, 15, and 17, and the drawings have been amended. Claims 1 and 3-19 remain pending in the application. Claims 1, 15, and 17 are independent.

New drawing Figures 6A, 6B, 7, and 8 have been added as required by the examiner and the written description portion of the specification has been amended to reflect the addition of the new drawings. The operation effected by the pressing station feature is illustrated in Figure 8. Support for Figures 6A, 6B, 7, and 8 and the associated written description is found in the original application disclosure.

Claims 1, 15, and 17 have been amended in response to the suggestion made by the examiner during the interview. Claim 1 has been amended to even more clearly define the structure of the base insert device. Instant claim 1 includes the recitation of the head positioning device feature. Support for the instant recitation of the head positioning device feature is found at, for example, the paragraph bridging specification pages 6 and 7, and in drawing Figures 2 and 3. Independent claims 15 and 17 have been amended in a manner that parallels the amendment of claim 1.

No new matter has been introduced through the foregoing amendments, and entry of each of the amendments is respectfully requested. The sole objection and rejection are respectfully submitted to be obviated in view of the aforementioned amendments and the remarks presented herein.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Boger and Vijuk

Claims 1 and 3-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,687,137 to Boger et

al. (hereinafter "Boger") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,044,873 to Vijuk.

The rejection of claims 1 and 3-19 under § 103(a) based on Boger and Vijuk is respectfully deemed to be obviated. For at least the reasons explained in Applicants' reply filed September 29, 2008, and the following reasons, the combined disclosures of Boger and Vijuk would not have rendered obvious Applicants' presently claimed invention.

As indicated above in the introductory remarks, instant claim 1 includes the recitation of the head positioning device feature.

The combined disclosures of Boger and Vijuk do not teach each feature of Applicants' presently claimed device. The examiner asserts that "Boger et al. disclose that the application head is provided with an application plate (20, fig. 2) in which several glue outlet openings (98) are each arranged equidistantly (see fig. 2) on one line in a direction perpendicular to the feed direction of the sheets and/or the folds of the bases" (Office Action page 4). This is accurate in the sense that Boger indeed discloses only one application head provided with one application plate.

In the next part of the above-quoted sentence the examiner states that "the application plates [are] configured such that adjoining glue outlet openings (60, 38) of two different application heads are positionable at a different distance than the distance between the glue outlet openings." However, as indicated

above, Boger only discloses one application head provided with one application plate. Consequently, Boger does not disclose that within the two application heads all openings are arranged equidistantly with a distance A and that the openings, which are adjacent to each other but which belong to different application plates, can be positioned so that their distance is smaller than the distance A.

Furthermore, neither Boger nor Vijuk suggests replacing the separated application valves by an application head as taught by Boger. Even assuming that a person skilled in the art were to make the aforementioned replacement, the result will not be Applicants' claimed base insert device. The reason is as follows. Looking at Fig. 2 of Boger, one realizes that the distance between the outmost opening (60) and the edge of the application head is on the order of the distance of two openings 60. This means that if two application heads as taught by Boger were placed next to each other as taught by Vijuk, the adjacent glue outlet openings that belong to different application heads would have a distance that is twice the distance of two openings within one application head. The aforementioned result is contrary to that which is defined in claim 1. Again, an important concept and feature of Applicants' claimed invention is that the distance is smaller than the distance of the openings within one application head. That is, as claimed, "adjoining glue outlet openings of two different application heads

are positionable with the head positioning device at a smaller distance than the distance (A)."

Accordingly, the combined disclosures of Boger and Vijuk would not have rendered obvious the invention defined by Applicants' instant claim 1. Claims 3-14 are allowable because they depend from claim 1, and for the subject matter recited therein. Independent claims 15 and 17 have been amended in a manner parallel to that of claim 1, and are similarly allowable.

In view of the foregoing, this application is now in condition for allowance. If the examiner believes that another interview might expedite prosecution, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

By: 
Harvey B. Jacobson, Jr.
Reg. No. 20,851

400 Seventh Street, N. W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 638-6666
Date: April 17, 2009